



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

08/417,174 04/05/95 KAWAKAMI

Y 2026-4124UIS1

EXAMINER

HM31/0420

HANF BUNIS PAPER NUMBER

MR. WILLIAM FEILER  
MORAGAN & FINNEGAN  
345 PARK AVENUE  
NEW YORK NY 10154

17

1642  
DATE MAILED:

04/20/98

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

<b>Advisory Action</b>	Application No. <b>08/417,174</b>	Applicant(s) <b>Kawakami et al</b>
	Examiner <b>Sheela J. Huff</b>	Group Art Unit <b>1642</b>

THE PERIOD FOR RESPONSE: [check only a) or b)]

a)  expires \_\_\_\_\_ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.

b)  expires either three months from the mailing date of the final rejection, or on the mailing date of this Advisory Action, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for the response expire later than six months from the date of the final rejection.

Any extension of time must be obtained by filing a petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a), the proposed response and the appropriate fee. The date on which the response, the petition, and the fee have been filed is the date of the response and also the date for the purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. Any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.17 will be calculated from the date of the originally set shortened statutory period for response or as set forth in b) above.

Appellant's Brief is due two months from the date of the Notice of Appeal filed on \_\_\_\_\_ (or within any period for response set forth above, whichever is later). See 37 CFR 1.191(d) and 37 CFR 1.192(a).

Applicant's response to the final rejection, filed on Apr 10, 1998 has been considered with the following effect, but is NOT deemed to place the application in condition for allowance:

The proposed amendment(s):

will be entered upon filing of a Notice of Appeal and an Appeal Brief.

will not be entered because:

- they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search. (See note below).
- they raise the issue of new matter. (See note below).
- they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal.
- they present additional claims without cancelling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: In claim 29 it is not clear what the amount is effective for.

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

Applicant's response has overcome the following rejection(s):

IF the amendment had been entered, the rejections under 35 USC 112, second paragraph would have been overcome.

Newly proposed or amended claims \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment cancelling the non-allowable claims.

The affidavit, exhibit or request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

Applicant argues that the reference does not anticipate the instant claims because of the requirements of "effective amount" and "pharmacologically acceptable". The "effective amount" is immunologically effective. Since antibodies

The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.

For purposes of Appeal, the status of the claims is as follows (see attached written explanation, if any):

Claims allowed: 15-28

Claims objected to: none

Claims rejected: 29-31

The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_  has  has not been approved by the Examiner.

Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_

Other antibodies to ME20 are made in the reference, the amount is immunologically effective. In the making of antibodies, the protein is administered to an animal and thus meets the limitation of the terminology "pharmacologically acceptable".

  
**SHEELA J. HUFF**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**  
**ART UNIT 1642**